



Claims readable on the elected species are, for example, Claims 1-8, 13 and 14.

The requirement with respect to Group VIII (Claims 15-16) is being traversed for the reasons set forth in detail below.

The Examiner restricted Claims 15 and 16 and classified as Group VIII as being drawn to complex compositions. However, Claims 15 and 16 depend from independent Claim 14. Thus, Claims 15 and 16 are patentable once one of the ingredients, e.g., at least one compound according to Claim 1, has also been shown to be novel and nonobvious. MPEP 806.05(c) states:

Where a combination *as claimed* sets forth the details of the subcombination *as separately claimed*, there is no evidence that combination AB_{sp} is patentable without the details of B_{sp}. The inventions are not distinct and a requirement for restriction must not be made or maintained, even if the subcombination has separate utility. (emphasis added)

The Examiner did not show any evidence that Claims 15 and 16 are patentable without the details of Claim 14. Also, since Claims 15 and 16 depend from independent Claim 14, there should be no additional search burden on the Examiner. Accordingly, the restriction requirement

with respect to Group VIII is not proper, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw this restriction.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By Booyong S. Lim
Booyong S. Lim
Registration No. L0200
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: July 21, 2006